REMARKS

Claims 2-8, 11-13, 15, 18-22, 29-33, and 35-40 were pending in the present application. In the above amendments, claims 2-8, 13, 15, 18-21, 29-33 and 35-36 have been amended, and claims 37-40 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter is added by way of the claim amendments. Therefore, after entry of the above amendments, claims 2-8, 11-13, 15, 18-22, 29-33, and 35-36, will be pending in this application for reconsideration.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance, which prompt and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Summary of the Office Action

In the Final Office Action, claims 2-8, 11-13, 15, 18-22, 29-33, and 35-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,914,695 to Walters et al. ("Walters") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0162497 to Curtiss et al. ("Curtiss") further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,305,254 to Findikli ("Findikli"). These rejections are traversed in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 2-8, 11-13, 15, 18-22, 29-33, and 35-40

Independent claims 29, 33, 35 and 36 are amended to clarify that the invention, as a whole, is drawn to communications between 1) a mobile telephone (i.e., not a personal computer) comprising a computer platform in the form of a mobile telephone processor and a mobile telephone operating system (i.e., not a PC or server running Windows® or Linux) and 2) a peripheral device selected from the group consisting of printers, scanners, keyboards, mice, viewers, displays, and joysticks (i.e., not a mobile phone accessory). The dependent claims are likewise amended to refer to the mobile telephone consistent with the amendments to the independent claims. Support for the amendments is provided throughout the specification, including in paragraphs Fig. 1, [0006], [0016], and [0018]-[0021]. When a peripheral device begins a communication session with the mobile telephone and the peripheral device is not identified by the computer platform, the computer platform determines the communication protocol and then automatically maps to a *resident* program for communication with the peripheral device (i.e., "if said peripheral device is not identified, determining a communication protocol of said peripheral device, wherein the determined communication protocol is used to

automatically map to a corresponding one of said resident programs"). Applicant submits that amended claims 29, 33, 35 and 36 are patentable because the recite elements not disclosed in the cited references.

In contrast to the amended claims, Walters is drawn to a personal computer (PC) or server communicating with a PC peripheral device, and Curtis and Findikli are drawn to mobile phones communicating with mobile phone accessories. None of the applied prior art teaches or fairly suggests providing communication between a mobile telephone and a peripheral selected from the group consisting of printers, scanners, keyboards, mice, viewers, displays, and joysticks (which are typical personal computer devices) in the manner claimed.

As admitted at page 3 of the Final Office Action, "Walters does not explicitly disclose *automatically* mapping the peripheral device" (emphasis in original). As previously submitted by Applicant, Walters *requires* device identification in order to work (*see e.g.,* Walters, FIG. 8, the device ID), thus *teaching against* the present invention and its handling of *unidentified* devices based on *communication protocol*.

In Curtis, as discussed in paragraphs [0058]-[0059], if the accessory device is not identified, the mobile device loads stored *control data* that is most similar to the control data of the accessory device, accesses the memory of the accessory device and updates the control data. This is typical of mobile phones, which commonly rely on the simple control data version ID and can only provide simple control data. As such, Curtis' teaching of using control data *teaches against* the presently-claimed use of *resident programs* for communication.

In Findikli, the mobile phone and the phone accessory perform a handshake and the software required to control the accessory is transferred from the phone accessory to the mobile phone, as illustrated in Figure 2. Explicit in this process is the identification of the accessory to the mobile phone (215) such that Findikli never encounters the recited condition of "if said peripheral device is not identified." Indeed, Findikli further teaches against the present invention by teaching communication via *transferred software* as opposed to a *resident program* which, by definition is already "residing" on the mobile telephone.

Applicants submit that the Examiner's position with respect to the state of Findikli *after* the software has been transferred at 235 has nothing to do with the condition as presently recited in the claims, which is "if said peripheral device is not identified." Further, the Examiner's position completely ignores the recited element requiring that "the one or more resident programs are *stored in a memory* of the mobile telephone *prior to* said peripheral device

selectively communicating with said mobile telephone," as recited in each of independent claims 29, 33, 35 and 36. As with Walters and Curtiss, Findikli further fails to determine "a communication protocol of said peripheral device, wherein the determined communication protocol is used to automatically map to a corresponding one of said resident programs" as recited in claims 29, 33, 35 and 36. The final Office Action is silent regarding this claim element.

In sum, Applicant submits that none of the cited references disclose or fairly suggest facilitating communication between a mobile telephone and a peripheral device of a personal computer, "determining a communication protocol of said peripheral device, wherein the determined communication protocol is used to automatically map to a corresponding one of said resident programs" when "said peripheral device is not identified" and that "the one or more resident programs are stored in a memory of the mobile telephone prior to receiving the indication of the start of the communication by the peripheral device." Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 29, 33, 35 and 36 are patentable over the cited references. Since dependent claims 2-8, 11-13, 15, 18-22, and 30-32, and 35-36 depend from one of claims 29, 33, 35 and 36, Applicant submits that these claims are also allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 2-8, 11-13, 15, 18-22, 29-33, and 35-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments contained herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 4, 2010

By: /James T. Hagler/

James T. Hagler
Reg. No. 40,631
(858) 651-0266

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-1714
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502